



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mere formality. It must be remembered too that a large majority of the Senate as at present constituted are in favor of the treaty, a number of them preferring no amendment. If the treaty should be ratified, it is reasonable to suppose that the Senate as a whole, feeling the responsibility which its own action in amending the treaty will have laid upon it, and satisfied with having preserved to itself what it considers one of the most important of its prerogatives, will be even less disposed to delay an arbitration proposed by the President than has been the case in the past. This view, it seems to us, is much the more rational one. It is always best to take all the ground that it is possible to win and hold it. Even if the treaty should prove much less valuable in practice than this view supposes, it will be at least an immense step forward that the two governments have solemnly agreed to adopt between them the principle of general arbitration for disputes which may arise. All the rest will come in time, for reforms do not go backward.

If the treaty should fail entirely, it may be a very serious blow to the cause of arbitration in other countries, where its friends are accustomed to use as one of their most powerful means of propaganda the example of the United States. Our country has already suffered seriously in the estimation of the citizens of other countries on account of the opposition to the treaty in the Senate. A nation is always judged by the acts of its government, and the Senate in this instance is a part of the government. The majority of men will not and often cannot go back of a government to find out what the people really think. We have always judged Great Britain, unjustly to be sure but really, by the course of her government during our Civil War, not by the actual feelings and wishes of the English people, whom the government did not represent. It will be the same in the case before us. If the treaty fails, the injury which our country will thereby have done to a cause which it has always been loud in pretending to uphold, can be repaired and will be, but it cannot be done in a day. The spirit of the thirty men in the Senate will be transferred to the whole nation, and we shall have "hypocritical" and "pretentious" written over our national doors, and our reputation for love of right and truth and for progress in all that elevates and blesses humanity will be seriously stained.

THE GRANT MONUMENT DEDICATION.

All American citizens honor the memory of President Grant and have wished him to have a suitable monument. Even those who do not believe in war see much in him which they would be false to themselves if they did not admire intensely as well as sincerely. General Grant, though a stern and unyielding fighter and the greatest general that our country has ever produced, was not in character a military man at all, in the professional sense

of the term, paradoxical as this statement may seem. War he looked upon only as the direst of necessities, to be laid at once and absolutely aside when its immediate purpose was accomplished. The spirit of the professional militarist who sees in war a means of personal preferment and of glory to the nation was to him a grewsome and disgusting spirit.

All of us remember with feelings of the highest admiration Grant's generosity toward the conquered army and the General who surrendered to him at Appomattox. There was no stage-playing in this; it was the sincerest expression of his nature. "Each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, *not to be disturbed by United States authority* so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they reside." Those were the terms which he dictated, which grew out of his feeling that there should be no vindictive policy toward the South, and which he always afterwards, when others were clamoring for the heads of a lot of the Southern men, insisted that the government should faithfully adhere to. "Let us have peace" will remain one of the last quoted of all Grant's sayings.

Grant's connection with the Treaty of Washington which brought about the settlement of the Alabama claims,—a treaty which could never have come into existence without his hearty coöperation as President—will cause his name always to be mentioned with the highest regard by the friends of international concord. In an interview with some of the friends of peace at Philadelphia General Grant once said: "Though I have been trained as a soldier and have participated in many battles there never was a time when, in my opinion, some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward to an epoch when a court recognized by all nations will settle international differences instead of keeping large standing armies, as they do in Europe." In 1884 he wrote to a meeting in Philadelphia, presided over by Bishop Simpson: "My views on the subject of peaceful arbitration in the settlement of international differences instead of the sword have not changed. It is only by keeping the subject alive, however, that it can be accomplished." On his journey round the world, when asked to act as umpire in a dispute between China and Japan, he said to the Chinese Minister, Prince Kung: "An arbitration between two nations may not satisfy either party at the time, but it satisfies the conscience of mankind, and must commend itself more and more as a means of adjusting disputes. The world is becoming civilized and learning that there is a better way to settle difficulties than by fighting." Previously at Birmingham, England, in reply to an address from the Arbitration Union of that city, he gave utterance to similar sentiments: "Though I have followed a military life for the better part of my years, there was never a day of my

life when I was not in favor of peace on any terms that were honorable. It has been my misfortune to be engaged in more battles than any other general on the other side of the Atlantic; but there was never a time during my command when I would not have gladly chosen some settlement by reason rather than by the sword. I am conscientiously, and have been from the beginning, an advocate of what the society represented by you, gentlemen, is seeking to carry out; and nothing would afford me greater happiness than to know, as I believe will be the case, that at some future day the nations of the earth will agree upon some sort of a congress which shall take cognizance of international questions of difficulty, and whose decisions will be as binding as the decision of our Supreme Court is held binding on us. It is a dream of mine that some such solution may be found for all questions of difficulty that may arise between different nations. I would gladly see the millions of men who are now supported by the industry of the nations return to industrial pursuits, and thus become self-sustaining, and take off the tax upon labor which is now levied for their support."

Is it possible that he who said all this; that he who originated the Indian "Peace Policy" by which Indian wars have become a thing of the past; that he who refused the Duke of Cambridge's request to review the troops of the Queen, because he "did not wish to see any more soldiers"; is it possible that Ulysses S. Grant, if he had been in New York on the 27th ult., would have been pleased to have the dedication of the great Monument to his memory made the occasion of a display in which the military features practically eclipsed everything else? It seems to us that the bringing together on that occasion of nearly forty thousand soldiers, militiamen and cadets was not only out of harmony with General Grant's real character, but also entirely in opposition to the high purposes which such a monument ought to be made to serve in our time and our American civilization. It is unfortunate, even humiliating, that the public authorities or private organizations having such things in charge seem incapable of getting up a suitable ceremony without bringing in all the "fuss and feathers" of a great military parade, a thing grand enough in itself, but repulsive to right-minded people, as it was to General Grant, when the ghastly system, in whose support such parades are kept up, is held in mind. We have been told that the authorities of Philadelphia, at the time of the placing of the great statue of William Penn on the City Hall, discussed the matter of getting up a demonstration in memory of the founder of the State, but abandoned it *because it could not be done without a military parade*, which of course would never do in the case of the great Quaker. Is it still true that there is nothing held to be highly honorable and worthy except war and war trappings,—even in America? Many a boy who stood on the sidewalks of New York and saw the military pro-

cession go by will have gone to his home with the impression that Grant was nothing but a military hero, and with his head filled with the silly, un-American, mischievous notion that to be a military hero is the greatest thing in the world.

General Grant ought to have had a monument, dedicated with proper ceremonies to his worthy and exalted memory, but the occasion ought not to have been made one for, even indirectly, glorifying militarism and inspiring love for war and its "pomp and circumstance" in the breasts of American boys, whom God has appointed to grow up and live for the noble ends of peace.

THE GRAECO-TURKISH CONFLICT.

Who was the cause of the deplorable conflict between Greece and Turkey, which has already cost thousands of lives and millions of money? Greece? Yes. The Powers? Yes. Turkey? YES. The whole of Europe, with the exception of a few of the small nations, has been guilty of the sins and crimes, the follies and falsehoods, the selfishness and greed, which have brought on the present bitter and ruinous conflict. In such a complicated mass of iniquity, of which the great armaments of Europe are the visible expression, it is impossible to estimate in any exact way the guilt of those who have been one way and another participants in the long line of criminal events which have at last brought the Greeks and Turks into deadly hostilities, and must, if continued, sooner or later bring other powers into open rupture.

Those are right who assert that Greece has foolishly and recklessly, almost insanely, brought upon herself what she ought to have known would be inevitable defeat and disaster, and possibly ruin. Those who appeal even their just cause to the sword ought not to be surprised if the sword persists in deciding, as it always has decided, not according to the law of right, but according to the law of might. Nor ought they to be surprised, if those who live under the law of the sword do not come to their support.

Those are no less right who declare that the Powers are responsible for the conflict. These so-called Powers have looked on with diabolical indifference and seen the Armenians butchered by the thousands, and the Cretan Christians pillaged and massacred decade after decade. Having undertaken to make Turkey institute certain reforms, they have stood impotently by and let her deliberately violate her pledges and laugh in the faces of their High Mightinesses. They told her to run the border between herself and Greece along a certain line, and when his Sultanity proceeded to make another line to suit his pleasure they smiled and said, "That's right; that's just as we would have it." They carried out their pompously made threat of blockade just enough to drive Crete and Greece into fury and to encourage Turkey to believe that